

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

Matthew Travis Houston,

Plaintiff,

v.

Golden Entertainment, et al.

Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-00499-JAD-DJA

Order

Before the Court are Plaintiff's two motions for appointment of counsel. (ECF Nos. 39, 41). Plaintiff's first motion is a form motion for appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 39). But Plaintiff adds no facts related to his particular case or his ability to present his claims. (*Id.*). Without more, the Court cannot conclude that Plaintiff has demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist to warrant appointing counsel. *See Agyeman v. Corrections Corp. of America*, 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th Cir. 2004). The Court thus denies Plaintiff's first motion. (ECF No. 39). Plaintiff's second motion is nearly identical to another of Plaintiff's motions to appoint counsel that the Court denied for containing numerous unrelated and nonsensical pages. *Compare* (ECF No. 41) *with* (ECF No. 36). The Court denies Plaintiff's second motion for the same reason. (ECF No. 41). Moreover, the Court has already recommended dismissal of this case for Plaintiff's repeated failure to file a fully complete application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF No. 32).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's motions for appointment of counsel (ECF Nos. 39 and 41) are **denied**.

DATED: November 29, 2022



DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE